

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 7, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-11 are canceled, and claims 18-35 are withdrawn from consideration in this application. Claims 12-17 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claims 12-17 have been amended. Claims 12-35 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 12, 14 and 16 have been amended to recite “each of the pulses is to be of the first state and continuously has same values”. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,279,035 to Skerlos (hereinafter “Skerlos”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,713,040 to Lee (hereinafter “Lee”).

The rejection of claims 12-17 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 12 and 13 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “...generating a detection reference signal;...determining the absence or the presence of the input signal if the number of pulses of the signal of the first state is not less than a predetermined plural number during an input interval of the detection reference signal, being different from the signal of the first state, wherein each of the pulses is to be of the first state and continuously has same values.” Claims 14 and 15 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “...generating a detection reference signal;...determining the absence or the presence of the input signal if the number of pulses of the signal of the first state is not less than a predetermined plural number during an input interval of the detection reference signal, being different from the signal of the first state, wherein each of the pulses is to be of the first state and continuously has same values.”

Claims 16 and 17 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...generating a detection reference signal;...determining the presence or absence of the input signal if the number of pulses of the signal of the first state is not less than a predetermined plural number during an input interval of the detection reference signal, being different from the signal of the first state, wherein each of the pulses is to be of the first state and continuously has same values."

The Examiner alleged that the claimed "predetermined interval" is broadly interpreted as the duration of the 'ok pulse flag' in Skerlos and the claimed "number of continuous values of the signal of the first state" is broadly interpreted as any duration of time during the "predetermined interval" at which the 'ok pulse flag' is actively high. In the case, "predetermined interval" and "number of continuous values of the signal of the first state" use same signal, 'ok pulse flag'.

But, in the present invention, the claimed "predetermined interval" indicates 'an interval of a detection reference signal Refvsync' and the claimed "number of continuous values of the signal of the first state" indicates 'output signal' being different from the detection reference signal as shown in paragraph [0049].

None of Skerlos and Lee teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 12-17 are allowable over Skerlos and Lee.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 7, 2009

By



Eric J. Nuss

Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant